

Summary of RIM Feedback/Concerns/Comments

- Number of violations too arbitrary, nature of violation and individual offender more important.
- No consensus on a specific number of violations to trigger hearing. Some violations should trigger a hearing or notice to court/BOPP on the 1st violation. Identification of those most important to Board/Judges.
- RIM delegates all decisions to AP&P.
- RIM may be an internal document if that level of detail necessary for AP&P, but it's too detailed, complex & unwieldy.
- Need a "stakeholder" level approach, "overview," or macro level as opposed to micro level approach for the guidelines.
- Proximal and distal goals not addressed sufficiently.
- Can't fit everyone into a box.
- Limit proximal goals to maximum of 3.
- Judge and County Attorney "buy in" issues – can't solve an adaptive issue with a technical solution.
- Treatment should not be part of the "sanctioning" process.
- The magnitude of the response is too formulaic.
- Nature of violations need to be distinguished better: technical / risk reduction / criminal
- Control conditions vs treatment conditions need to be distinguished better.
- Criminal behavior should not be addressed administratively.
- Building in "levels" appears to be building in additional violations based on the numbers, not the nature of the violation or the individual offender.
- Public safety should still be emphasized as primary concern.
- Need to distinguish who is making the decision based on the nature of the violation and the offender's risk level.
- How can judges and Board be assured a "response/sanction" will actually be imposed?
- Unclear what happens after each violation: restart or move up?
- Unclear how much contact PO will have with offender? If contact is limited to once a month, building in a number of violations will tie the length of probation and likelihood of notice to court/Board to just the number of contacts.
- LSI-R and RANT – is their cross-validity? Judges more comfortable with RANT and still in need of validation studies on the LSI-R.
- Needs to be more user-friendly. Too complex.
- Needs to be capable of adaptation state-wide, not just a Salt Lake County document.
- Due process concerns with "waiver" process at level 4.
- Programs should fit within the guidelines, not be referenced specifically (Drug Court, CATS, Carey, MRT)
- 4:1 necessary? Reward and sanction together?